

Foreign Affairs - Vol 37, No. 4 July 1959
The Senate in Foreign Policy - Hubert H. Humphrey

p. 527 -- "we in the U.S. might well give more attention to the central
values of the old diplomacy -- The ability to conduct confidential
negotiations confidentially.

p. 530 - "The role of the Senate in dealing directly with international
problems is severely & properly limited by the Constitution, which
vests in the Executive Branch exclusive powers to conduct foreign
relations.

p. 532 "A member of Congress is primarily a politician and a
diplomat: he sees things abroad through a different set of lenses ---
Visits with foreign officials which do not confuse contact with
entreat do not pressure upon the exclusive Presidential
prerogative -

534 - [stop loyal to Legis. Branch in counterintelligence operations]
"Control access to the facts and intelligence available from all
branches, government

THE SENATE IN FOREIGN POLICY

535

sations where independent research is carried on and from special Senate studies. Adequate staffing will alone enable Congress to escape from uniformed acquiescence on the one hand and irresponsible obstruction on the other.

VII. THE PROBLEM OF FRAGMENTATION

The Founding Fathers bequeathed to us a government in which there is a separation of powers and a system of checks and balances. Some critics maintain that such a government is incapable of meeting the fast-moving demands of a technological age or of competing successfully with the dynamic, planned offensives of an expansionist totalitarian system. While I reject this view, I do acknowledge that "government as usual" is not good enough.

Our problem today does not seem to me to be primarily structural or bureaucratic so much as the lack of leadership at the top. Even a loose-fitting and overlapping governmental structure can be made to work if there is a sense of urgency and direction; and this only dynamic leadership can provide.

Even under present conditions there are some things in the area of structural manipulation which would enable us to deal more effectively than we do now with the challenges of the continuing crisis. The Executive Branch and the Congress are fragmented. There are a score of Executive agencies dealing with foreign policy in addition to the State Department and the Department of Defense. One sometimes gets the impression that the Bureau of the Budget is the most important of them all. Theoretically, the President with the aid of the National Security Council is supposed to sort out the priorities and coordinate a great variety of policies in the light of an agreed, long-range strategy. Unfortunately this rarely happens, first because the agreed strategy does not exist, second because the National Security Council is so preoccupied with day-by-day crises that it seldom has time for long-range planning.

The problem raised by the extent of governmental fragmentation is deep and pervasive and there are no easy answers. But I believe that the time has come to consider seriously the creation in the Executive Branch of a permanent research and policy-analyzing agency charged with the responsibility of thinking about comprehensive national strategy, embracing in that term all essential factors of domestic and foreign policy. This agency would relate the total capacities of the American people.

—military, economic, technical, intellectual and moral—to their responsibilities of international leadership. Without elaborating my proposal here, I want to make it clear that I do not regard such an agency as a substitute for politics—as an alternative to the present responsibilities of the Executive and Legislative Branches. I am not proposing that an intellectual élite be called in to decide our fate for us, but merely that an agency along the lines described could help our Government to develop a better sense of perspective and to integrate and coördinate the many agencies and programs which now often operate at cross-purposes.

Perhaps the Congress could prompt the Executive to put its house in order by itself creating a Joint Committee on National Strategy, to include the chairmen and ranking minority members of the major committees of the House and the Senate. I have recently proposed such a Committee. Its purpose would be to look at our total national strategy—military, political, economic and ideological. This Committee, a counterpart in the Congress of what I have proposed for the Executive Branch, would not usurp the functions of any of the present Committees, but supplement them by endowing their work with a larger frame of reference. The Chairmen of the Committees represented would come away from the meetings of the new Joint Committee with a greater appreciation, for instance, of the relationship between fiscal policy and national productivity and how both factors relate to our defense posture and our negotiating position. Responsible statesmanship consists precisely in the capacity to see complex relationships in a perspective as broad as the national purpose itself.

No amount of structural manipulation can make up for a lack of leadership that is politically wise and morally responsible. But if the essential idea underlying these twin proposals were adopted, I believe it would make a modest contribution toward creating a more integrated national policy; and in the face of the Communist challenge, even a modest contribution toward better strategic planning is not to be brushed aside.

Congress was not created to govern, and it should not attempt to do so. Yet this is no time for Congress to submit meekly to the Executive will. In fact, it could not submit even if it were so inclined, because there is not one Executive will, but a number of conflicting wills which have not yet surrendered to the authority of an over-riding national purpose.